

**Benton County Planning Board
Technical Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
February 5, 2008, 5:30 p.m.**

Call to Order & Roll Call: The following Benton County Planning Board members were present: Mark Gray, Caleb Henry, Bill Kneebone, Tim Sorey, and Heath Ward. Scott Borman and Adele Lucas were absent. The following Benton County Planning Office staff members were present: Ashley Pope, Kathleen Davis and Karen Stewart.

Announcements:

Staff made no announcements.

Old Business:

There was no old business discussed.

Other Business:

1. Inquiry- **Fireworks Tents** - Benton County - Will Hanna, Benton County Fire Marshal

Fire Marshal Will Hanna came to the Planning Board asking for "guidance and direction". He stated that he would like to be able to track the fireworks stands in the unincorporated areas of Benton County. He said that the current system allows vendors of fireworks to issue State permits to the individual retailers. He stated that the permit is actually through the State Fire Marshal's office, which tallies the statewide permits, but does not separate the records by county.

Mr. Hanna stated that his intent is not to regulate or disallow these fireworks stands; he said that many cities have prohibited the sale of fireworks within their city limits, but he did not foresee the County doing so. He stated that fireworks are safer than they used to be, but added the caveat that they are still cause for concern. He stated that he made unofficial visits to some of the fireworks stands this past summer and noted some safety concerns.

Mr. Hanna added that local fire departments "have a need to know prior to the Fourth of July selling period how many stands are in their area..." He discussed how many of these stands are hidden in out-of-the-way areas. He pointed out that it would change the local fire department's response if they knew that they were going to a fireworks stand rather than to a residence.

Mr. Hanna handed out a draft of a permit application that could be used and pointed out that one of the most important pieces of information on the permit is the emergency name and phone number field. He said that the fireworks tents are required to be staffed overnight and added that some tents actually have people sleeping in them to prevent theft. He expressed concern that he had discovered two tents that were staffed by 14-year-old boys and stated that minors should not be sleeping in tents full of fireworks.

Mr. Hanna related that the Arkansas Fire Prevention Code has codes and ordinances for the regulation of fireworks stands. He said that the rules are simple and based on common sense; he gave examples such as "vehicles can't park within 20 feet (of a

fireworks stand), you can't be within 15 feet of a roadway..." He stated that there had been a "near miss" in Benton County: a vehicle fire singed a fireworks tent. Fortunately, the incident occurred in a location near the Centerton Fire Department, whose firefighters extinguished the fire before anything serious happened.

Ms. Pope asked if the section of the code that Mr. Hanna referred to was a part of the building code that Benton County would have to adopt; Mr. Hanna indicated that it was already a part of the adopted code. Ms. Pope clarified that it is a part of the adopted fire code; Mr. Hanna stated that it is and that it is under the heading of "Tents"; he added that this portion of the code would cover craft fairs, as well. Ms. Pope asked for the location of the code; Mr. Hanna stated that it is in Chapter 33 of the fire code, which "deals with the fireworks and their use." Ms. Pope asked, "So, we can administer that right now?" Mr. Hanna stated, "Yes, ma'am."

Ms. Pope stated that she had not been aware of that, thinking that it was in an appendix that had not been adopted by Benton County. Mr. Hanna clarified that Chapter 33 deals with fireworks, but Chapter 5 deals specifically with tents. He added that these had already been enforced in other situations.

Ms. Pope stated that she did not think that any action by the Board would be required; she said that there had been a misunderstanding and that the portions of the code governing tents and fireworks had already been adopted by Benton County. Mr. Hanna stated that the Board still needed to decide if applicants for fireworks stand permits would be charged for the permits; Ms. Pope stated that that would have to be decided by the Quorum Court.

Ms. Pope asked the Board if they wanted to address this issue using the regulations stated in the fire code, if they wished to write an ordinance specifically addressing this issue or if they wished to have the fireworks stands regulated under the current large scale development regulations. She stated that if the Board felt that the fire code was sufficient, they could make a recommendation to the Quorum Court regarding a fee.

Mr. Kneebone stated that the Fire Marshal should take this matter to the Quorum Court; he stated that the Board had no right to make any ruling in this case. Ms. Pope stated that the Board maintained the right to make a recommendation. Mr. Kneebone recommended that the Fire Marshal take the matter to the Quorum Court.

Ms. Pope asked for the Board's recommendation regarding the issue; Mr. Kneebone stated that it might be "a waste of time" since the fireworks stands have been operating for many years without any sort of regulation. Ms. Pope asked for comments from the remaining Board members.

Mr. Sorey asked if the County had ever received any complaints regarding fireworks tents; Mr. Hanna answered that there had been two complaints - one fireworks tents was reported to be too close to Interstate 540, another was reported to be on private property. Both complaints were resolved.

Mr. Kneebone asked if any complaints regarding safety had been made; Mr. Hanna stated that there had been none.

Ms. Pope stated that was looking at this issue from the perspective of things that the Board had regulated in the past, such as craft fairs; she stated that craft fairs are about 8 days out of the year, whereas fireworks stands operate for about 30 days of the year. She pointed out that these stands are also fire hazards. Mr. Hanna stated that fireworks stands may not be fire hazards, but they are concerns.

Mr. Ward stated that he felt that there should be some oversight and added, "I don't think it hurts to know who's out there with a large amount of explosives in a very confined area." Ms. Pope stated that it was just a matter of how much review the Board wanted to have - whether they wanted these applications to come before the Board or if they wished to have Staff handle them administratively.

Mr. Sorey stated that he did not think that the Board wanted to see these types of applications presented as large scale development applications; Mr. Gray and Mr. Ward concurred. Mr. Sorey stated that "I'm going to jump out and say that we don't want to see it." He stated that having a hundred of these applications in a one-month period could be problematic. He added that the locations, parking concerns, etc. should be reviewed during the process of issuing the permit. Mr. Sorey stated that some guidelines would need to be established; Mr. Hanna concurred and added that they "will probably be derived from the codes."

Mr. Kneebone asked if applicants for the State license were given any information regarding State regulations; Mr. Hanna stated that they are not.

Ms. Pope suggested that she and the Fire Marshal work together to determine a course of action; Mr. Hanna concurred.

Mr. Sorey stated that if a fee was to be charged for the permit, then the matter would have to be brought to the Quorum Court; Ms. Pope asked what the Planning Board's recommendation would be to the Quorum Court. Mr. Sorey stated that what the Fire Marshal is trying to accomplish is beneficial, so his recommendation would be minimal oversight. Mr. Ward suggested that Staff "Draft up something that can be handled administratively, that can be considered minimal oversight where the local fire departments know where it's at. That's the important thing: if there's an emergency folks know exactly where to go."

New Business:

1. Large Scale Development - **Our Shop** - 9953 Highway 72 East, Rogers - John Bevill

John Bevill, of 107 SE 13th street in Bentonville, represented the large scale development.

Ms. Pope showed photographs of the site taken the week of February 4th;

Mr. Kneebone asked if the Board had seen this before; Ms. Pope responded that this is Mr. Bevill's large scale development application. Mr. Sorey stated that the applicant had previously requested a variance from the large scale development requirements, but the Board denied the request.

Ms. Pope stated that some checklist items have not yet been submitted to Staff; she added that the applicant is requesting a variance from the drainage and site plan requirements. She pointed out that the Board had been given a copy of a previously-completed tract split with the auto repair shop superimposed on the plat. Ms. Pope stated that the project is a change in the use of the property.

Mr. Bevill countered that the project is not a change in use, that it is simply more usage. He added that the shop building had been an auto repair business since it was built.

Mr. Sorey clarified that this is a large scale development application with waivers of the drainage and site plan requirements being requested; Ms. Pope stated that that was correct.

Ms. Pope stated that the applicant had turned in the hazardous chemical compliance letter, but that the septic system information, solid waste contract, and public utilities contract had not yet been submitted to Staff; she asked the applicant to submit copies of bills from these service providers. Mr. Bevill stated that his solid waste is disposed of in a Dumpster that he shares with his sister-in-law; he was not aware of who provided the Dumpster, but he would obtain a copy of the bill to submit to Staff.

Ms. Pope stated that Staff had not yet received a fire department letter. Mr. Bevill stated that the fire department had been out to the site and should have submitted a letter to Staff. Ms. Pope reiterated that Staff had not yet received it. Mr. Bevill stated that the fire department was "under the same impression that I was - that this was going to happen on the 20th instead of tonight." Ms. Pope explained that the Board would not act on the application at the TAC meeting; they were merely going through the application and taking the opportunity to ask questions about the project.

Mr. Sorey asked if there was anything else; Ms. Pope stated that the Fire Marshal would need to visit the site.

Mr. Sorey asked if the building has a bathroom in it; Mr. Bevill stated that it does. Mr. Sorey asked where the water comes from; Mr. Bevill stated that it comes from a well.

Ms. Pope stated that a minimum requirement for this project would be a screening or wood privacy fence around the perimeter of the property; she added that that is a requirement of the Benton County ordinance governing salvage yards.

Mr. Sorey asked how many vehicles would be kept on site; Mr. Bevill answered that the number would fluctuate, but would average about 30 vehicles.

Mr. Sorey asked, "... there's no gravel to speak of - it just there all parked in the grass, right?" Mr. Bevill stated that that was true. Mr. Sorey asked if Mr. Bevill is proposing any gravel; Mr. Bevill responded that he would gravel the area and put in a privacy fence once his project is approved by the Board.

Ms. Pope stated that there was an issue with what has been submitted as the site plan, since a drawing was superimposed over someone else's survey. She asked the Board if they were comfortable with the site plan the way it is. Mr. Sorey stated that he didn't think Mr. Costello (the original surveyor) would be comfortable with it; Ms. Pope agreed.

Mr. Gray asked Mr. Bevill if he had someone draw this plan for him; Mr. Bevill answered that he and a friend of his "measured it off, walked it off and did it to scale - the same scale that was on the original." Mr. Gray asked if the person who helped him was a consultant; Mr. Bevill stated that he was not.

Mr. Gray stated that "probably a stick figure drawing would have been better than having someone else's drawing resubmitted seven or eight years later on someone else's title block." Mr. Bevill apologized, stating that this was what had been suggested to him as a way of getting the Board the information that they needed; Mr. Gray stated that the title block and the signature on the survey needed to be taken off, since it was not Mr. Costello's original work.

Mr. Sorey stated that the applicant should eliminate the border, the title block, and the legal description for all but tract 2 and show just the "interior picture." Mr. Bevill agreed to provide whatever the Board required on the site plan.

Ms. Pope stated that it appeared that Mr. Sorey was marking the site plan for Mr. Bevill; Mr. Sorey stated that the owners' certification and dedication, the Benton County Planning acceptance, everything that has signatures, the title block, the stamp and surveyor's declaration all need to be taken off of the site plan.

Mr. Gray stated that the septic system and the well needed to be located on the plat; Mr. Bevill asserted that they are already on there on tract 1. Mr. Sorey asked if the well supplied water to anyone else; Mr. Bevill answered, "I have no clue." Mr. Sorey noted the easement and said that he assumed that the well supplied water to the neighboring residence, as well.

Ms. Pope asked the Board to consider establishing hours of operation; she said that there had been one complaint regarding loud noise at night at this business.

Ms. Pope then enquired about the privacy fenced area; she asked if the whole five-acre tract needed to be fenced, or if just the project area would suffice. Mr. Bevill stated, "All I intend to use for a shop is the 160 wide and 320 deep that I marked off." He added that if all goes as he has planned the work area will be confined to behind the shop.

Mr. Sorey asked if there was only the one residence behind Mr. Bevill's business that utilizes the same drive; Mr. Bevill answered affirmatively and stated that the house belongs to Mr. Henderson. Mr. Sorey stated that what he was looking at was whether or not the eastern fence line was heavily treed and expressed concern over the potential loss of trees; Mr. Bevill responded that it is not heavily treed and that his measurements go up to the tree line; he added that on the east side there are only 3 large trees and, "it wouldn't be hard to dodge those."

Mr. Sorey asked if the Board had any other concerns or comments; Ms. Pope enquired about the drainage requirements. Mr. Henry stated that a site plan that proposes any alterations was not submitted, so the Board does not have anything to evaluate. Mr. Gray asked, "From an engineering standpoint, does gravel help?" Mr. Henry stated that it could increase runoff.

Mr. Sorey stated the plan that Mr. Bevill submitted should show where the proposed fence would be located, as well as any proposed screening or buffering, and the limits of the proposed gravel. Once all of these items are represented on the plan, then the Board can

evaluate whether or not a drainage study is required. Mr. Sorey added that, at some point, the applicant would have to add gravel; Mr. Bevill agreed. Mr. Sorey reiterated that the limits of the gravel would need to be shown on the plan where one would enter or exit the drive and that the locations of the gates would need to be shown on the plans in order for the Board to have a basis for evaluation. Mr. Sorey added that the Board would need to see the topographic information, even if it is only the USGS quadrangle map of the project location.

Mr. Henry asked about the site plan variance; Mr. Sorey responded that it would not be needed since the applicant would be supplying all of the information normally found on the site plan.

Mr. Gray said that except for the cost of a drainage study, the rest of Mr. Bevill's application could be self-prepared.

Mr. Henry asked about the well and where the water for the shop is coming from; Mr. Bevill answered that there is a service line from the well to the shop. Mr. Henry asked if the well is the one depicted on tract 1; Mr. Bevill answered that it is. Mr. Gray asked if it is "a defined-enough trench that you could show it on this drawing and how it gets there?" Mr. Bevill answered affirmatively.

Mr. Sorey stated "I think Mr. Borman is going to raise the issue of if this well supplies a commercial operation, what the State has to say about that. And also, if that same well is providing water to that residence, I don't know that that's doable. If it is all doable, at minimum, I think what Mark is saying there is, if we show where the trench is, you would need an easement for that line coming off of tract 1 for the benefit of tract 2 so that you could have rights to that..." Mr. Bevill stated that all of this was pre-existing and he did not know what agreements had been made "between neighbors and friends."

Ms. Pope asked if the owner of tract 2 owned any of the adjoining parcels; Mr. Bevill stated that, to his knowledge, the owner only owns the five-acre tract of land. Mr. Sorey said, "I would venture to say that this needs its own well, and if tract 1, that corporation that's sitting there, is using that well, and it is also providing water service to that house on tract 4, I'm not sure that that's permitted without the correct permit."

Mr. Gray asked Mr. Bevill if he paid a water bill; Mr. Bevill stated that he did not. Mr. Bevill added that there is only one small restroom in the building and that he will occasionally use 1 to 2 gallons of water in a vehicle.

Mr. Sorey stated that if the well serviced multiple residences or businesses, it would have to be a community well

Ms. Pope asked if the Board was "leaning towards granting the variances on the site plan and the drainage;" Mr. Sorey stated that a variance on the site plan would not be required. Ms. Pope asked, "Why not?" Mr. Sorey stated that the applicant would be providing all of the information and asked if that would meet the site plan requirements; Ms. Pope agreed that it would.

Mr. Gray stated that "This is not professionally certified, it's self-prepared;" he added that he thought that applicants should be allowed to prepare their own site plans except for certain engineering requirements.

Mr. Sorey asked Mr. Bevill what the dimensions of the cross-hatched area of his site plan would be; Mr. Bevill responded that "the dimensions around the edges would be 20 feet wide down the side of the shop, 40 across the back... the overall is 60 and 180 from the front edge of the shop to the back of the tree line is 180 feet... that's the parking. The whole package is 320 feet from the driveway to the tree line." Mr. Sorey suggested putting dimensions on the plan. Mr. Gray asked about the U-shaped cross-hatched area; Mr. Bevill indicated that this would be the area around the shop where he intended to park cars.

Mr. Sorey asked if Staff had received the verification of notification of adjoining property owners; Ms. Pope stated that she had.

- Submit septic system information
- Submit solid waste contract (copy of bill will suffice)
- Submit public utilities contract (copy of bill will suffice)
- Remove the border, the title block, the owners' certification and dedication, the Benton County Planning acceptance, everything that has signatures, the stamp and surveyor's declaration, "filed for record" information and the legal description for all but tract 2 from the site plan.
- Show the fence, the gravel, the well line and the contours on the site plan.
- Investigate well situation with the Health Department.
- Have an easement prepared for the well line extension on Tract 2.

2. Large Scale Development - **O. A. K. Home Builders** - 13960 Hiwasse Road, Hiwasse - A. P. Kiesel

Anthony Kiesel represented the proposed large scale development.

Ms. Pope stated that all stipulations had been met, except for the drainage information; she asked if the applicant would be requesting a variance of the drainage requirements. Mr. Kiesel stated that he had contacted Bill Platz of W/R Consulting; Mr. Platz is working on the drainage requirements.

Ms. Pope stated that her recommendation to the Board would be to require a note on the plat stating that no rebuilding would be allowed in the setback; Mr. Kiesel interjected that it is the concrete sidewalk that is showing as being in the setback.

Ms. Pope asked the Board to consider requiring paved parking; she added that the building does not have plumbing, only electric and that the public notifications had been made. She showed photographs of the site and stated that if they would be using the area she pointed out for open storage that the area would probably need to be screened or privacy fenced.

Mr. Henry asked if the applicant would need a variance from the setback requirements; Ms. Pope answered that concrete is allowed in the setback, so if he obtains a drainage letter, the applicant should not need any variances.

Regarding the paved parking requirement, Mr. Kiesel stated that he has dump truck-loads of gravel being brought to the site and that he would be concerned that the weight of these trucks would break up the concrete. Ms. Pope asked if concrete driveways would be possible. Mr. Sorey asked if the site is located on a State highway; Mr. Kiesel answered that it is a County road. Ms. Pope clarified that it is not on Highway 279, it is off of Hiwassee Road.

Mr. Kiesel stated that one of his entrances is a concrete driveway. Ms. Pope stated that she believed that paved parking would work better. Mr. Kiesel stated that the main traffic to this site consists of his son meeting a crew in the morning to load their trucks; he added that there is not very much "drop-in business."

Mr. Sorey stated that "the part of the paving for a parking lot that you've got to be careful of is the ADA requirements for any commercial building. You have to have a paved, handicapped-accessible area." He added that the Planning Board does not enforce this requirement, but it is mandated by law. He added that since the applicant does have heavy truck traffic entering and exiting the property, the edge of the asphalt would deteriorate over time unless the applicant puts in a concrete drive or limits truck traffic to the existing concrete drive. Mr. Kiesel asked if it would be acceptable to put in a concrete "approach." Ms. Pope clarified that it would be a concrete apron. Mr. Sorey said, "That's the best thing to do there." He added that he agreed with Ms. Pope that screening would be necessary; Mr. Kiesel also agreed.

- Screen or privacy fence
- Concrete apron on driveway

3. Large Scale Development Inquiry- **TradeWind Energy, LLC** - Location to be added - Jennifer Dean

This item was withdrawn from the agenda.

4. Large Scale Development Inquiry - **JJ Johnson** - 14411 Springtown Road, Siloam Springs – Haz-Mat Storage

JJ Johnson represented the inquiry.

Ms. Pope stated that Mr. Johnson's business would be run from his property, which is outside of the city limits of Highfill, Springtown, Gentry and Siloam Springs. She showed an aerial photograph of the site. She explained that his business entails cleaning up hazardous materials after automotive accidents. She stated that he would be parking a trailer on the property.

Mr. Johnson stated that the business, Environmental Cleanup, is a "haz-mat response team" and would temporarily store hazardous materials, such as diesel fuel and oil, on site in "container boxes or overpack drums" until approval is received for proper disposal. Ms. Pope asked if hazardous materials would be stored in his shop or in trailers; Mr. Johnson responded that materials would be stored in trailers or in "open-top container boxes" with liners to prevent leakage of any contaminated materials.

Mr. Ward clarified that "you're going to take the remediated soil or substances, they're going to be in a sealed overpack drum, you then intend on putting them in a lined vessel of some sort." Mr. Johnson stated that this was correct and added that the materials would be stored until they were disposed of in the landfill.

Ms. Pope stated that the question in this case is whether or not the Planning Board would require a full large scale development submission. Mr. Ward stated that it depended on what type of operation this would be; he felt that more information was necessary.

Mr. Gray asked if materials would be unloaded at the site and stored or if the materials would remain on a trailer; Mr. Johnson answered that materials would be loaded onto a trailer at the site of an accident and may be unloaded at the proposed site, but that everything would be sealed and nothing would reach the ground.

Ms. Pope interjected that Mr. Johnson had spoken with Benton County's Department of Emergency Management. Mr. Johnsons stated that he had spoken with DEM and that they told him that he needed to bring his project to the Board.

Mr. Ward stated that his "overwhelming concern" was what would happen if something at the site leaked and how it would be handled. Mr. Johnson assured him that it would be "dug out and hauled to the landfill." Mr. Ward encouraged Mr. Johnson to have "a good, effective plan" in place in case of leakage.

Mr. Johnson stated that the company he works for, Environmental Cleanup, is based in Oklahoma City, OK and has been in business for 17 years. He stated that he will have the same operation here that they do there.

Mr. Sorey stated that some of the large scale development requirements, such as a site plan, topographic information, and public notifications, would have to be done. Ms. Pope asked if Mr. Johnson would need to submit a large scale development application; Mr. Sorey agreed that he would need to submit at least some of the large scale requirements.

Ms. Pope clarified that Mr. Johnson that would have to go through the large scale development process and stated that he should call her for assistance. Mr. Johnson asked if he could call the following day; Ms. Pope agreed that he could.

Other Business:

Ms. Pope stated that the Judge had spoken to the Quorum Court regarding the formation of a zoning committee. She stated that there were 11 members present at the meeting and that all 11 members voted in favor of forming the committee. She stated that there were some reservations about forming a committee without having a plan first.

Ms. Pope proposed using a general plan process involving steps listed in the "Green Bible," which she explained is a book that is indispensable for those in professional planning. She said that when using the following list, "you go from not having a plan to having ordinances and implementing them." The list is as follows:

- Step 1: Identify issues, opportunities, and assumptions
- Step 2: Formulate goals
- Step 3: Collect and analyze data
- Step 4: Revise goals and determine objectives
- Step 5: Develop and evaluate alternative plans
- Step 6: Select and adopt the preferred plan
- Step 7: Implement the general plan
- Step 8: Monitor and amend the plan

Ms. Pope stated that steps 1 through 6 are the planning process and that steps 7 and 8 are implementing the plan. She informed the Board that she used these steps when she created the scope of work for creating the general plan. She proposed using this general framework for the zoning committee to move forward with the plan.

Ms. Pope directed the Board's attention to the list of citizens interested in becoming involved in the zoning committee; she stated that a public involvement plan would be necessary. She proposed a public involvement strategy in which "the people on the committee in one group that make the recommendations to the Quorum Court or the Committee of 13, and then... we would have citizens that are interested in planning and zoning in another group or focus group."

Ms. Pope stated that each of these two groups would be a voting body, operating in a manner similar to the U. S. Congress: each body would have to vote to approve a plan before it would move forward. She stated that this plan would be time-consuming, but that given the number of people involved it should simplify the process. She stated that this method would put pressure on the two bodies to build consensus.

Mr. Kneebone stated that he believed that the previous attempts at passing a zoning ordinance had met with such resistance because the Board had failed to sufficiently involve the public. Mr. Ward agreed with Mr. Kneebone and stated that if the process was a bit slower and painstaking but involved the public it was more important than being expeditious. He asserted that both groups would need adequate leadership in order to keep the process moving forward and that the two groups would occasionally need to meet together.

Mr. Kneebone stated that each group could elect its own chairman and that the chairmen could communicate to keep everyone informed. Ms. Pope stated that it would give "people with their various interests" the opportunity to get involved in the process, but cautioned that it should not appear to be "the government doing this versus the government working with the people to do something."

Mr. Sorey asked about the "zoning survey to date;" Ms. Pope stated that 37 surveys have been completed to date, 23 of those were in favor of zoning in the county, 12 were against zoning in the county, and 2 were unsure. Of the 37 surveys completed, 6 of them were completed by citizens who indicated that they neither lived in an unincorporated

area of Benton County nor did they own property in an unincorporated area of Benton County, so their answers were excluded from the "adjusted" number of surveys.

Mr. Sorey asked if Ms. Pope had compiled the raw data and then pulled some of the surveys out; Ms. Pope stated that that was true and clarified that the surveys that were pulled out were the ones that answered "no" to the first two questions.

Ms. Pope stated, "Statistically, these numbers don't mean much; we don't have enough sample here to really draw any conclusions."

Mr. Sorey said, "So basically you have... 37 people paying attention." Ms. Pope asked if the Board wished to further advertise the survey. Mr. Ward asked how many weeks it had been advertised; Ms. Pope answered that it had been advertised for one day in the newspapers. She pointed out that it is an Internet-based survey, so some people without Internet access would be excluded from taking the survey. She told the Board that she could advertise in different ways and could distribute paper surveys.

Mr. Sorey stated that he didn't think it was possible to over-advertise; Mr. Ward agreed.

Sue Elverston asked the Board if it was possible to ask Scarlet Sims of The Morning News to mention the survey in one of her articles about the Planning Office; Ms. Pope stated that she could do that.

Mr. Sorey asked if the only County mailers that are sent out are the tax bills; Ms. Pope stated that Staff could do a mailing. Mr. Sorey asked when the tax bills are mailed out; Ms. Pope stated that tax bills are normally received by May and are due in October. Mr. Sorey stated, "If the timing worked out, that'd be a great way of making sure not a soul that owned property in this county that didn't get notified."

Ms. Pope asked who the Board wanted on the committee that the County Judge wanted to form; she stated that the committee would be comprised of a couple of Planning Board members and a few Justices of the Peace. Mr. Ward clarified that the list of interested citizens that was handed out was not the same as the list of people that would be on the Judge's committee. Mr. Sorey asked if Staff had received a list of recommended committee members from the Judge; Ms. Pope stated that she had not received a list, but that the Judge had made some recommendations such as a few members of the Planning Board, a few members of the Quorum Court, and some professionals.

Ms. Pope asked which of the Board members wished to be on the committee; Mr. Ward stated that he would be glad to serve.

Mr. Henry asked Ms. Pope to explain the concept of the two separate voting bodies; he clarified that one group would be the Judge's committee. Ms. Pope stated that the other group would be a focus group to involve the public and obtain their comments. Each section of the plan would be subject to approval by a majority of the committee.

Ms. Pope asked which of the Board members would have the time to serve on this committee. Mr. Henry asked how often the committee would meet; Ms. Pope answered that it would probably be twice per month, so there would be a total of 4 meetings per month for the Planning Board members that serve on the committee. Mr. Henry stated that he would not have any issues with serving, but was cautious about over-committing himself.

Mr. Sorey asked how many people would be on the Judge's committee and wanted to know if citizens would be on the committee; Ms. Pope stated that citizens could be on the committee if the Board wanted them to be. Mr. Sorey stated that if the focus group was comprised of private citizens, then the Judge's committee should only have one or two citizens. He stated that there should only be a total of about seven people on the Judge's committee.

Ms. Pope stated that she had Mr. Ward to be on the committee and that the Judge had recommended Justice Kurt Moore (whom she thought would be happy to serve on the committee). She asked if the Board wanted to have an odd number of people on the committee; Mr. Sorey stated that they should.

Mr. Sorey asked for the opportunity for the Board members to discuss this matter with their significant others, and to talk with Mr. Borman and Ms. Lucas. He asked if the members of the committee meeting needed to be set tonight; Ms. Pope stated that she would like to set a meeting date. Mr. Sorey told her to set a date; Ms. Pope stated that February 21st appeared to be valid date, but it would be the day after the Planning Board meeting.

Mr. Sorey stated that this could be discussed at the next meeting of the Planning Board and that Staff could email the Justices of the Peace to find out who else is interested in serving on the committee. Ms. Pope stated that she had hoped to "come up with some people tonight - that we at least want to ask to be on the committee."

Mr. Kneebone suggested that Sue Elverston could serve on the Judge's committee; Ms. Pope pointed out that she is already serving on the citizen's committee. Mr. Sorey asked if some of the municipal planners from the cities in Benton County could be invited to serve on the committee since they have education and experience in dealing with the same types of issues.

Ms. Pope stated that she had considered asking Jeff Hawkins of Northwest Arkansas Regional Planning to join the committee because he would provide a lot of insight; Mr. Sorey concurred.

Mr. Sorey asked if the rest of the potential committee members could contact Ms. Pope either via email or at the next Planning Board meeting; Ms. Pope asked if any of the Board members had anyone in mind that they would like to ask to serve on the committee. Mr. Sorey stated that he did not know any of the Justices of the Peace well enough.

Ms. Pope stated that she would like to have Mr. Sorey and Mr. Henry serve on the committee. Mr. Sorey stated that he would have to consult his wife before making a commitment. Mr. Henry reiterated that he would have to take time to consider the matter before possibly over-committing himself.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 6:50 p.m.